

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

LeShawn Stradford,)	CASE NO. 1: 23 CV 2133
)	
Plaintiff,)	JUDGE DONALD C. NUGENT
)	
v.)	
)	
Cuyahoga County,)	<u>MEMORANDUM OPINION</u>
)	<u>AND ORDER</u>
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

Pro se Plaintiff LeShawn Stradford has filed a civil complaint in this action against Cuyahoga County. (Doc. No. 1.) The complaint does not set forth cogent allegations or legal claims. The complaint, in total, simply states: “I was wrongfully imprisonment Corruption Contain to the Federal Industry.” It seeks no specific relief. Plaintiff has filed no other pleadings with the Court.

Although *pro se* pleadings are liberally construed, *Boag v. MacDougall*, 454 U.S. 364, 365 (1982) (per curiam); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972), the lenient treatment accorded *pro se* plaintiffs has limits. See e.g., *Pilgrim v. Littlefield*, 92 F.3d 413, 416 (6th Cir.1996). *Pro se* litigants must still meet basic pleading requirements, and courts are not required to conjure allegations on their behalf. See *Erwin v. Edwards*, 22 Fed. App’x 579, 580 (6th Cir. 2001). Furthermore, federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction and have a duty to police the boundaries of their jurisdiction. “[A] district court may, at any time, *sua sponte* dismiss a complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil

Procedure when the allegations of a complaint are totally implausible, attenuated, unsubstantial, frivolous, devoid of merit, or no longer open to discussion.” *Apple v. Glenn*, 183 F.3d 477, 479 (6th Cir.1999).

The Court finds this action warrants *sua sponte* dismissal pursuant to *Apple v. Glenn*. The allegations in the complaint are so unclear, unsubstantial, and frivolous that they do not provide a basis to establish this Court’s subject-matter jurisdiction over any viable federal claim.

Conclusion

Accordingly, this action is dismissed for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction. The Court further certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Donald C. Nugent
DONALD C. NUGENT
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: January 2, 2024